

control list linking authorized users with all documents on the web servers, with the web servers screening the search results with the access control list to determine the documents for which a user performing a search has access." Office action, at 2.

Applicant respectfully submits that DuFresne does disclose, as the Examiner has provided, use of multiple access lists for a template, however, unlike what the Examiner has stated, DuFresne fails to disclose a single access control list linking users with all documents on the web servers or a single server. Specifically, DuFresne states, "[e]ach template further includes input fields for entering access control lists for specifying authorized users to read, write or execute the source in the template." DuFresne, Col. 3, line 67 to Col. 4, lines 1-2. "A preferred method of implementing a client-server application therefore begins with preparing a source template to a displayable page for processing...." DuFresne, Col. 4, lines 17-19. "A template prepared as above is retrieved for processing by the processor when a client makes a request for the corresponding displayable page." Dufresne, Col. 4, lines 30-32. Each template has access control lists and each template is prepared for a displayable page, therefore each displayable page has access control lists. Accordingly, DuFresne does not teach or suggest that one list is used to link users with multiple templates or documents. DuFresne discloses that each template has multiple access control lists.

In contrast, in the present invention, one access control list can be used to access multiple documents, so long as a user has access to multiple documents. Applicant's claim 1 recites, "the documents associated with an access control list linking the security level of users with the security level of documents on the web servers...." Additionally, independent claim 4 provides, "using an access control list associated with each document server...."

Claim 13 provides, "providing a plurality of document servers in the web sites, each having an association

with a plurality of documents... each document server having an access control list..."

Furthermore, as DuFresne discloses access control lists for each template corresponding to a displayable web page, DuFresne teaches away from the present invention which discloses use of a single access control list for possible access to a plurality of documents. Accordingly, DuFresne fails to teach or suggest the above-recited elements of Applicant's claims 1, 4 and 13.

The Examiner also provides that the DuFresne reference discloses *web servers that screen the search results with the access control list to determine the documents for which a user performing a search has access. Office action, at 2.* Applicant respectfully submits that the DuFresne reference actually provides "[a] template prepared as above is retrieved for processing by the processor when a client makes a request for the corresponding displayable page." DuFresne, Col. 4, lines 30-32. Additionally, the cited reference provides, "[a]nother aspect of the present invention relates to a method of controlling user access to a record in a database defined by the present invention. A preferred method begins with processing an access request from a client to a protected record in a database..." DuFresne, Col. 4, lines 40-44. As is clear from the cited reference, a user makes a request for a specific record. Therefore, multiple search results cannot be screened, as only one result is requested. Applicant's respectfully point out that the Examiner must refrain from using the teachings of the specification in determining obviousness. The Federal Circuit articulated this well established rule as follows:

The consistent criterion for determination of obviousness is whether the prior art would have suggested to one of ordinary skill in the art that this process should be carried out and would have a reasonable likelihood of success, viewed in the light of the prior art... Both the suggestion and the expectation of success must be founded in the prior art, not in the applicant's disclosure. In re Dow Chemical, 5 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1529, 1531 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

In contrast to the DuFresne reference, Applicant's claims recite screening search results. Specifically, claim 1 recites, "the web servers *screening the search results* with the access control list to determine the documents for which a user performing a search has access."

Additionally, claim 4 recites, "executing a query on a query server having access to a document index of documents available for searching on document servers provided in the web site by a person having a unique identification code without regard to access control limitations, *yielding a list of all relevant documents, each document having a unique URL, reviewing all URLs* by the document servers after the search is executed using an access control list associated with each document server to check whether each URL is compatible with the access level of the identification code of the person executing the query..."

Claim 13 recites, "providing a plurality of document servers in the web sites, each having an association with a plurality of documents, each document identified with a unique URL, each document server having an access control list defining user identification and for each user identification *listing URLs for which access is permitted or denied, determining by one of the document servers whether each URL is compatible* with the access level of the identification code of the person..."

As described in Applicant's specification, it is advantageous when, "instead of multiple control lists, a user enters, either manually or automatically, his or her user identification, together with the query to be searched." Applicant's specification, at page 2, lines 35-38. "[B]efore the hits are returned to the user, the hits are 'screened' by determining from the web server whether the user has access using an access control list associated with the web server." Applicant's specification, at page 3, lines 5-9. "Hence, the net result is that the user appears only to be able to search documents that the user has access to." Applicant's specification, at page 3, lines 15-17.

DuFresne teaches that a client makes a request for a specific displayable page or single record in a database. Therefore, multiple search results are not requested/present and are not screened. Accordingly, DuFresne fails to teach or suggest elements of Applicant's claimed invention; in particular those elements recited above in independent claims 1, 4 and 13.

In rejecting the claims the Examiner states that, "DuFresne discloses the claimed invention except for the documents each having a security level, with each document and preventing the user from discovering the existence of said document titles through the use of the search engine." For the reasons stated above, Applicant respectfully submits that DuFresne fails to teach or suggest the claimed invention.

Additionally, Haverstock fails to supplement the missing teachings. Haverstock was concerned with "a system for enabling access to non-HTML objects from a web browser." Haverstock, abstract. Haverstock provides that its invention builds upon standard security by using an integrated ACL (access control list) technology so that a web server (Lotus Domino Server) can control the access and authorization to sensitive HTML objects to only those with appropriate privileges. Haverstock, Col. 7, lines 1-11. Haverstock does not teach or suggest how the ACL technology is used other than to say Haverstock builds upon standard security. Therefore, Haverstock fails to teach or suggest elements of Applicant's claimed invention recited above in claims 1, 4 and 13. For example, Haverstock fails to teach or suggest that a single access control list is used to link users to a plurality of documents. Accordingly, Haverstock fails to supplement the missing teachings of DuFresne.

Claims 2-3, 5-12, and 14-19 depend from claims 1, 4 and 13, respectively. These dependent claims are therefore distinguished from the cited references for at least the same reasons discussed above for claims 1, 4 and 13. As the pending claims are patentable over DuFresne in view of Haverstock, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

For the reasons presented above, Applicant submits that claims 1-19 are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Asst. Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231

Signed: Sally Azevedo
Typed Name: Sally Azevedo
Date: February 7, 2001

Respectfully submitted,

Gina McCarthy

Gina McCarthy

Reg. No. 42,986

P.O. Box 2-E

San Jose, CA 95109-0005

(408) 297-9733